



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### Comment on "Scrutinizing the carbon cycle and CO<sub>2</sub> residence time in the atmosphere" by H. Harde

**Citation for published version:**

Köhler, P, Hauck, J, Völker, C, Wolf-Gladrow, DA, Butzin, M, Halpern, JB, Rice, K & Zeebe, RE 2018, 'Comment on "Scrutinizing the carbon cycle and CO<sub>2</sub> residence time in the atmosphere" by H. Harde', *Global and planetary change*, vol. 164, pp. 67-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2017.09.015>

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1016/j.gloplacha.2017.09.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloplacha.2017.09.015)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Early version, also known as pre-print

**Published In:**

Global and planetary change

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Comment on “*Scrutinizing the carbon cycle and CO<sub>2</sub> residence time in the atmosphere*” by H. Harde

Peter Köhler<sup>a,\*</sup>, Judith Hauck<sup>a</sup>, Christoph Völker<sup>a</sup>, Dieter A. Wolf-Gladrow<sup>a</sup>,  
Martin Butzin<sup>a</sup>, Joshua B. Halpern<sup>b</sup>, Ken Rice<sup>c</sup>, Richard E. Zeebe<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Alfred-Wegener-Institut Helmholtz-Zentrum für Polar-und Meeresforschung (AWI),  
P.O. Box 12 01 61, 27515 Bremerhaven, Germany*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Chemistry, Howard University, Washington, DC, 20059, USA*

<sup>c</sup>*SUPA, Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, The Royal Observatory,  
Blackford Hill, Edinburgh, EH93HJ, UK*

<sup>d</sup>*SOEST, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

---

## Abstract

Harde (2017) proposes an *alternative accounting scheme* for the modern carbon cycle and concludes that only 4.3% of today’s atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is a result of anthropogenic emissions. As we will show, this *alternative scheme* is too simple, is based on invalid assumptions, and does not address many of the key processes involved in the global carbon cycle that are important on the timescale of interest. Harde (2017) therefore reaches an incorrect conclusion about the role of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In the following we will (i) clarify the difference between CO<sub>2</sub> atmospheric residence time and adjustment time, (ii) present recently published information about anthropogenic carbon, (iii) present details about the processes that are missing in Harde (2017), (iv) briefly discuss shortcoming in Harde’s generalization to paleo timescales, (v) and comment on deficiencies in some of the literature cited in Harde (2017).

**Keywords:** carbon cycle, anthropogenic carbon

---

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: [Peter.Koehler@awi.de](mailto:Peter.Koehler@awi.de) (Peter Köhler)

## 1. Residence time versus adjustment time

The global carbon cycle is currently not in a steady state as shown, for example, by measurements of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration at Mauna Loa (Hawaii) and at the South Pole since 1958 (Dlugokencky et al., 2016). The main reason  
5 for this increase is the addition of ‘anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub>’ by burning of coal, oil, and gas, industrial processes and land use change (Le Quéré et al., 2016). In the case of non-steady state conditions one can ask the question: How long will the perturbation (here: higher atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration) stay? If one adds a certain amount of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere at time  $t_0$ , the concentration will increase suddenly and then fall off following a complicated function  
10 that depends on the response of the various active carbon reservoirs (surface ocean, intermediate and deep ocean, marine sediments, terrestrial biosphere). The time connected to such an relaxation in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration is the **adjustment (or equilibration) time** and the timescale of interest for the problem at hand. The function how CO<sub>2</sub> relaxes after such an initial perturbation can be approximated by the sum of a few exponential functions with different characteristic timescales (e.g. Archer et al., 1997; Lord et al., 2016). Simple one-box models suggest adjustment times of about 70 years, but these models ignore many relevant processes and consequently under-estimate this  
15 timescale (Cawley, 2011). More complex models suggest adjustment (equilibration) times of well over 100 years, and that it depends on total anthropogenic emissions (Archer et al., 2009; Joos et al., 2013; Lord et al., 2016). When anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> is added continuously one has to run a global carbon cycle model that takes into account the responses by the various reservoirs mentioned  
20 above (e.g. Friedlingstein et al., 2006; Jones et al., 2013).

The timescale determined in Equations (7) and (8) in Harde (2017) is actually an approximation of the **residence time**, i.e. the average length of time for which an individual molecule of CO<sub>2</sub> remains in the atmosphere before being taken up by the ocean or terrestrial biosphere. Given the fluxes into, and  
30 out of, the atmosphere, we would expect a CO<sub>2</sub> molecule to only remain in the

atmosphere for a few years, before being replaced by a molecule from one of the other reservoirs. The usual misunderstanding is that this is CO<sub>2</sub> leaving the atmosphere, rather than mostly just being exchanged, leaving no change in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. Even though the numbers presented in Harde  
35 (2017) are reasonable approximations for the residence time, they are largely irrelevant for what the paper later presents.

Changes in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration following the initial perturbation depend on the net CO<sub>2</sub> flux out of the atmosphere, rather than - as in the case of the residence time - depending only on the flux into the natural sinks. Note  
40 that the residence and adjustment times refer to different and distinct aspects of the carbon cycle and have different definitions; a distinction clearly made in the IPCC First Assessment Report (Houghton et al., 1990, §1.2.1) as well as in more recent reports (Stocker et al., 2013, p. 1457). Thus to conflate residence time and adjustment time is a fundamental misunderstanding of the carbon cycle.

45 Given this difference between the residence time (years) and adjustment time (centuries to millennia) we would also not expect an enhancement in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> to be entirely composed of molecules of directly anthropogenic origin, even if the cause for such an enhancement were entirely anthropogenic. Therefore, the claim in Harde (2017) that the anthropogenic contribution makes  
50 up only 15% of the increase since the industrial era - even if correct - is not an indication that the increase is not entirely anthropogenic.

## 2. Most recent anthropogenic carbon inventory

Total anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> from fossil fuel and cement production emitted between 1750 and 2010 has accumulated to 365 PgC (Le Quéré et al., 2016). A  
55 further 153 PgC was emitted in the same time interval from land use changes (Le Quéré et al., 2016). In 2010 the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration was approximately 390 ppm (Dlugokencky et al., 2016), a value that features prominently in the calculations of Harde (2017).

Anthropogenic carbon in the ocean can be tracked by various methods, e.g.

60 the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  Suess effect (Eide et al., 2017),  $\Delta C^*$  method (Gruber et al., 1996),  
 or anthropogenic produced substances, such as CFCs (Lauvset et al., 2016).  
 Various approaches have shown that the oceanic sink accounts for 48% of the  
 total fossil-fuel and cement-manufacturing  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions of 118 PgC emitted  
 between 1800 to 1994 (Sabine et al., 2004). Landschützer et al. (2016) cal-  
 65 culated an increase in anthropogenic carbon in the ocean of about 60 PgC  
 released by fossil-fuel and cement-manufacturing  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions between 1982  
 and 2012. Taking the temporal overlay of both studies into account, we find  
 an anthropogenic carbon inventory of the fossil-fuel and cement-manufacturing  
 $\text{CO}_2$  emissions 1800–2012 in the ocean of about 150 PgC. This is 41% of the ac-  
 70 cumulated emission from fossil fuel and cement production, or 29% of the total  
 emissions including land use change. In this scenario, the rise in atmospheric  
 $\text{CO}_2$  from a preindustrial value of 278 ppm (= 589 PgC) before 1750, to 390 ppm  
 (= 827 PgC) in 2010 is solely due to anthropogenic emissions. They overprint  
 any potential natural  $\text{CO}_2$  outgassing from the ocean, see the decomposition  
 75 of anthropogenic and natural fluxes between ocean and atmosphere in Gruber  
 et al. (2009). The rise in the atmospheric carbon reservoir by 112 ppm, or  
 238 PgC, corresponds to an airborne fraction of 46% of the total anthropogenic  
 emissions of 518 PgC. The missing residual of the anthropogenic emissions of  
 130 PgC is assigned to terrestrial carbon uptake.

80 According to Harde (2017), 4.3% of the actual atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concen-  
 tration is of anthropogenic origin. With an atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration of  
 390 ppm used in Harde (2017), reached in  $\sim 2010$ , this is similar to a proposed  
 anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration of about 17 ppm or 36 PgC. It would im-  
 ply that only 7% of the total anthropogenic emissions remained airborne. The  
 85 airborne fraction of Harde (2017) is therefore a factor of 6.6 smaller than in  
 the inventory that is supported by observational-based studies. If the approach  
 in Harde (2017) was correct, it would directly asked for evidence where this  
 anthropogenic carbon has been stored. Unfortunately, no further evidence for  
 this storage has been given in the paper and as we have shown above, it cannot  
 90 reside in the ocean.

### 3. Why is the Harde model too simple?

The core argument in Harde (2017), section 3, is about the lifetime of anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$  in the atmosphere, closely related to the airborne fraction that remains after a given time. A framework is then developed in which both  
95 natural and anthropogenic carbon fluxes are analysed. In this framework one important part of the carbon cycle, which is of major relevance for the airborne fraction of  $\text{CO}_2$ , is missing: the carbonate chemistry in the ocean. It is correctly stated that Henry’s Law governs the net gas exchange of  $\text{CO}_2$  between the surface ocean and the atmosphere, with higher temperatures leading to a  
100 higher net flux to the atmosphere. However, within the ocean  $\text{CO}_2$  molecules react with water to form carbonic acid ( $\text{H}_2\text{CO}_3$ ) which subsequently dissociates into hydrogen ions ( $\text{H}^+$ ) and bicarbonate ions ( $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ). In a second step the  $\text{HCO}_3^-$ -ion dissociates into another  $\text{H}^+$ -ion and a carbonate ion ( $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ ). The sum of all these carbon species is typically referred to as dissolved inorganic  
105 carbon (DIC). For present day conditions the fraction of carbonic acid is negligible; the majority of DIC ( $\sim 90\%$ ) is found as  $\text{HCO}_3^-$ ,  $\sim 9\%$  as  $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ , and only about 1% is found as dissolved  $\text{CO}_2$  (Zeebe & Wolf-Gladrow, 2001). Only this 1% of DIC in the surface ocean, found as dissolved  $\text{CO}_2$ , can exchange with the atmosphere. Thus, the carbonate chemistry represents a bottleneck for the  
110 oceanic uptake of anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$  emitted to the atmosphere.

This effect of the carbonate chemistry on the carbon cycle is not a theoretical concept, but an observed quantity also known as the Revelle (or buffer) factor  $R$ . This is a fundamental property of the marine carbonate system and is implicitly considered in marine carbon cycle models underlying the analyses summarized  
115 in the IPCC-AR5, the 5th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (Stocker et al., 2013). The carbonate chemistry in seawater describing these processes in detail is well known (compare, for example Dickson et al., 2007; Zeebe & Wolf-Gladrow, 2001). The Revelle factor is defined as the ratio of the relative change of dissolved  $\text{CO}_2$  to the relative change of DIC and

120 can be readily calculated:

$$R = \frac{\Delta\text{CO}_2/\text{CO}_2}{\Delta\text{DIC}/\text{DIC}} \quad (1)$$

From open ocean data it is known that  $R$  varies between 8 and 15 (Sabine et al., 2004). A Revelle factor of 8, for example, leads to a DIC increase by only 12.5% for a doubling of dissolved  $\text{CO}_2$ . A rise in atmospheric and oceanic carbon content goes along with an increase in the Revelle factor, a phenomenon  
125 which is already measurable (e.g. Hauck et al., 2010). This implies that the oceanic uptake of anthropogenic carbon will become slower if we continue to increase anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions. This is already seen in all CMIP5 model simulations (Jones et al., 2013). The scientific literature describing the marine carbonate chemistry, which, if complete, automatically includes the Revelle  
130 effect, is based on decades of laboratory experiments, field observations and theoretical understanding of the underlying chemical processes and is very well established. The books by Dickson et al. (2007); Zeebe & Wolf-Gladrow (2001) are only two examples of the state of knowledge in this field.

The carbonate chemistry is the most relevant part of the carbon cycle, which  
135 is of importance on the timescale of interest, yet ignored in the erroneous approach of Harde (2017). Further processes with different impact on the airborne fraction of anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$ , which are of relevance if longer timescales are of interest (e.g. necessary for the generalization and application to the paleo data) are ocean overturning, carbonate compensation and continental weathering rates (Lord et al., 2016). If implemented in a model this results in an  
140 airborne fraction of anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions of around 40% on a 100-year timescale falling to  $\sim 18\%$  on a 1000-year timescale (Joos et al., 2013) and down to 5% and 2% on timescales of  $10^5$  and  $10^6$  years, respectively (Lord et al., 2016).

145 Remark: Most of these details above on the role of the carbonate chemistry have been taken from another comment some of the authors published as part of the online discussion on another, overly simplistic, and therefore biased approach to explain the modern carbon cycle (<http://www.earth-syst-dynam->

discuss.net/6/C813/2015/esdd-6-C813-2015.pdf).

150 **Harde’s flawed 1-box carbon cycle:** One key element of Harde’s carbon cycle is the assumption of a simple absorption/decay process, which is unsuitable for the problem at hand. Harde’s Eq. (11) reads:

$$\frac{dC_{\text{CO}_2}}{dt} = e_T - \alpha \cdot C_{\text{CO}_2} , \quad (2)$$

where  $C_{\text{CO}_2}$  is the atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration,  $e_T$  is a total emission rate,  $\alpha = 1/\tau$  is an absorption efficiency, and  $\tau$  is Harde’s  $\text{CO}_2$  “lifetime”. Thus, Harde assumes that  $C_{\text{CO}_2}$  can be predicted by solving only a single rate equation of the carbon cycle (other reservoirs may exist but their time evolution is ignored). However, at any given time  $t$ , the  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes into and out of the atmosphere depend on, for instance, the atmosphere-ocean disequilibrium, which in turn depends on simultaneous changes in ocean carbon inventory and seawater chemistry, as explained above. Thus, even the simplest carbon cycle model must at minimum comprise two boxes for atmosphere and ocean (including Revelle factor), whose equations are solved simultaneously. For investigations of timescales longer than centuries (e.g. in paleo applications as done in the generalization) processes which export carbon from the surface to the deep ocean (so-called carbon pumps, see Volk & Hoffert, 1985) also need to be taken into consideration, asking for at least another deep ocean box. Yet, Harde (2017) ignores this fact (and many others) that have been established in over 60 years of carbon-cycle research (a few examples include Revelle & Suess, 1957; Oeschger et al., 1975; Heimann & Maier-Reimer, 1996; Archer et al., 2009; Joos et al., 2013). As a result, the approach in Harde (2017) leads to fundamentally flawed mass balances,  $\text{CO}_2$  “lifetimes”, and thus erroneous conclusions.

Note also that the posited analogy to radiocarbon and other isotopes is incorrect because changes in bulk inventory (total atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$ ) are confused with changes in tracers at minute concentration (strongly influenced by dilution). Furthermore, the record of atmospheric radiocarbon is perturbed/depleted by the emission of  $^{14}\text{C}$ -free  $\text{CO}_2$  from fossil fuels — the so-called  $^{14}\text{C}$  Suess effect (Suess, 1955; Köhler, 2016) — and points to much longer atmospheric adjust-



ment time on the order of 100 years for 1985–2005 (Levin et al., 2010).

#### 4. Paleo approximations

180 Finally, Harde (2017) generalizes the results that incorrectly model the modern carbon cycle to draw, again erroneous, conclusions about the paleoclimate record (section 3.3 and Figure 3). Here, again, various shortcomings invalidate the conclusions. The main ones are the following:

(a) **Glacial temperature:** The assumed surface temperature change for 185 glacial times of  $-8$  K is wrong, as the source cited (Petit et al., 1999) approximates not global temperature change, but that over East Antarctica. According to some recent studies the global temperature change at the last glacial maximum with respect to preindustrial times was  $-4.0 \pm 0.8$  K (Annan & Hargreaves, 2013). It is furthermore not clear to the reader how the data points in Figure 3 190 were generated with one data point for a temperature of 8, 10, 12,  $14^\circ\text{C}$ , while the underlying paleo data from the Vostok ice core contain several thousand data points of the last 420,000 years, also including periods which have been warmer than the preindustrial climate.

(b) **Explaining paleo  $\text{CO}_2$ :** Harde (2017) proposes that the complete 195 glacial/interglacial change in  $\text{CO}_2$  can be explained by a reduction in surface temperature. However, it is nowadays well established, that glacial/interglacial changes in atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  can not be explained by one single process (e.g. Köhler et al., 2005; Brovkin et al., 2007; Kohfeld & Ridgwell, 2009). Significant change in atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  on glacial/interglacial timescales are expected from 200 a rise in sea surface temperature, rising sea-level, reduced marine export production, and responses from carbonate compensation, together with changing land carbon storage (Kohfeld & Ridgwell, 2009). Although models still disagree on the contribution of individual processes, the common consensus is, that the glacial/interglacial rise in temperature (more precisely sea surface temperature) 205 might be responsible for a rise in atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  mixing ratio of 20-30 ppm. The arguments in Harde (2017) are rather vague, but also seem to assume, that

the temperature change might also trigger a change in terrestrial carbon storage. This concept would therefore need to have higher terrestrial carbon storage in cold periods, that might then be released during deglacial warming. However, the glacial terrestrial carbon storage is nowadays found to be smaller (not larger) in glacial times than during the preindustrial period (Ciais et al., 2012). So, again evidence contradicts what is needed to support the concept set forth in Harde (2017). One might now argue, that all mentioned processes vary synchronous with temperature, and therefore the chosen temperature-dependency in Harde (2017) might be a possible simplification. However, this would largely ignore the complexity of the carbon cycle-climate system including the fact that the paleorecords also contain interglacial periods with higher than preindustrial global surface temperature, but similar atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, such as the last interglacial about 130,000 years ago (e.g. Bakker et al., 2013; Past Interglacials Working Group of PAGES, 2016).

(c) **Paleo CO<sub>2</sub> data:** Furthermore, Harde (2017) argues that due to distortion and diffusion the CO<sub>2</sub> data from ice cores are rather imprecise leading to large error bars for CO<sub>2</sub> shown in Figure 3 and to 20–30 ppm lower values than reconstructions based on fossil stomata. It must be clarified that ice core based CO<sub>2</sub> perfectly overlaps with the instrumental measurements of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> which started in 1958 and we therefore see no support for the contention that they might be biased to lower values (e.g. Ahn et al., 2012; Rubino et al., 2013). Furthermore, short term variations seen in stomata-based CO<sub>2</sub> during the Holocene have been heavily criticized, and when averaged for known enclosure characteristics of gas bubbles in ice cores have not been confirmed in ice core-based records (e.g. Ahn et al., 2014; Köhler et al., 2015). Together, the scientific arguments are in favour of the ice core-based CO<sub>2</sub> records and not of that based on fossil stomata.

## 5. Citations and some details on IPCC

235 Harde (2017) cites throughout various parts of the contribution of Working  
Group 1 (physical science basis) to the IPCC-AR5 (Stocker et al., 2013) and  
proposes *alternative views* on the impact of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and  
related global temperature increase. This approach is inappropriate because it  
fails to address the actual underlying literature of the IPCC-AR5. The IPCC  
240 summarizes the state of the art in the peer-reviewed literature. Hence neither  
the residence time nor the adjustment time are assumptions or interpretations  
of the IPCC-AR5, but robust outcomes of the underlying science, which is sum-  
marized in the report. In presenting *alternative concepts* to the view presented  
in the IPCC-AR5 the article of Harde (2017) ignores and is in contradiction to  
245 the state of knowledge in the field, most obviously in the conflation of residence  
and adjustment times.

Some of the citations in Harde (2017) are inappropriate, including video  
presentations, and do not meet the standards of the peer-reviewed literature.

Further, Harde (2017) cites two papers (Essenhigh, 2009; Humlum et al.,  
250 2013) that were subject to highly critical peer-reviewed comments (Cawley,  
2011; Masters & Benestad, 2013; Richardson, 2013; Kern & Leuenberger, 2013),  
none of which are referenced in Harde (2017). In fact, Harde (2017) repeats  
many of the same arguments that have already been refuted.

## 6. Conclusion

255 In conclusion, Harde (2017) does not provide an *alternative view* of the  
carbon cycle, but uses a too simplistic approach, that is based on invalid as-  
sumptions, and which leads to flawed results for anthropogenic carbon in the  
atmosphere. We suggest that the paper be withdrawn by the author, editor or  
publisher due to fundamental errors in the understanding of the carbon cycle.

## 260 Acknowledgements

We thank Gavin Cawley for language editing and some stimulating discussions, and Gavin Schmidt for starting this discussion on realclimate.org.

## References

- Ahn, J., Brook, E. J., & Buizert, C. (2014). Response of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> to the abrupt cooling event 8200 years ago. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*, 604–609. doi:10.1002/2013GL058177.
- Ahn, J., Brook, E. J., Mitchell, L., Rosen, J., McConnell, J. R., Taylor, K., Etheridge, D., & Rubino, M. (2012). Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> over the last 1000 years: A high-resolution record from the West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS) Divide ice core. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *26*, GB2027. doi:10.1029/2011GB004247.
- Annan, J. D., & Hargreaves, J. C. (2013). A new global reconstruction of temperature changes at the Last Glacial Maximum. *Climate of the Past*, *9*, 367–376. doi:10.5194/cp-9-367-2013.
- Archer, D., Eby, M., Brovkin, V., Ridgwell, A., Cao, L., Mikolajewicz, U., Caldeira, K., Matsumoto, K., Munhoven, G., Montenegro, A., & Tokos, K. (2009). Atmospheric lifetime of fossil fuel carbon dioxide. *Ann. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *37*, 117–134. doi:10.1146/annurev.earth.031208.100206.
- Archer, D., Kheshgi, H., & Maier-Reimer, E. (1997). Multiple timescales for neutralization of fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub>. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *24*, 405–408. doi:10.1029/97GL00168.
- Bakker, P., Stone, E. J., Charbit, S., Gröger, M., Krebs-Kanzow, U., Ritz, S. P., Varma, V., Khon, V., Lunt, D. J., Mikolajewicz, U., Prange, M., Renssen, H., Schneider, B., & Schulz, M. (2013). Last interglacial temperature evolution — a model inter-comparison. *Climate of the Past*, *9*, 605–619. doi:10.5194/cp-9-605-2013.
- Brovkin, V., Ganopolski, A., Archer, D., & Rahmstorf, S. (2007). Lowering of glacial atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in response to changes in oceanic circulation and marine biogeochemistry. *Paleoceanography*, *22*, PA4202. doi:10.1029/2006PA001380.

- Cawley, G. C. (2011). On the Atmospheric Residence Time of Anthropogenically  
 290 Sourced Carbon Dioxide. *Energy & Fuels*, 25, 5503–5513. doi:10.1021/ef200914u.
- Ciais, P., Tagliabue, A., Cuntz, M., Bopp, L., Scholze, M., Hoffmann, G., Lournan-  
 tou, A., Harrison, S. P., Prentice, I. C., Kelley, D. I., Koven, C., & Piao, S. L.  
 (2012). Large inert carbon pool in the terrestrial biosphere during the Last Glacial  
 Maximum. *Nature Geoscience*, 5, 74–79. doi:10.1038/ngeo1324.
- 295 Dickson, A. G., Sabine, C. L., & Christian, J.-R. (Eds.) (2007). *Guide to Best Practices  
 for Ocean CO<sub>2</sub> Measurements*. PICES Special Publication 3.
- Dlugokencky, E., Lang, P., Mund, J., Crotwell, A., Crotwell, M., & Thoning, K. (2016).  
 Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Dry Air Mole Fractions from the NOAA ESRL Carbon  
 Cycle Cooperative Global Air Sampling Network, 1968-2015 Version: 2016-08-30.  
 300 URL: [ftp://aftp.cmdl.noaa.gov/data/trace\\_gases/co2/flask/surface/](ftp://aftp.cmdl.noaa.gov/data/trace_gases/co2/flask/surface/).
- Eide, M., Olsen, A., Ninnemann, U. S., & Eldevik, T. (2017). A global estimate of the  
 full oceanic <sup>13</sup>C Suess effect since the preindustrial. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*,  
 . doi:10.1002/2016gb005472.
- Essenhigh, R. H. (2009). Potential Dependence of Global Warming on the Residence  
 305 Time (RT) in the Atmosphere of Anthropogenically Sourced Carbon Dioxide. *En-  
 ergy & Fuels*, 23, 2773–2784. doi:10.1021/ef800581r.
- Friedlingstein, P., Cox, P., Betts, R., Bopp, L., von Bloh, W., Brovkin, V., Cadule,  
 P., Doney, S., Eby, Fung, I., Bala, G., John, J., Joos, F., Kato, T., Kawamiya,  
 M., Knorr, W., Lindsay, K., Matthews, H. D., Raddatz, T., Rayner, P., Reick,  
 310 C., Roeckner, E., Schnitzler, K.-G., Schnur, R., Strassmann, K., Weaver, A. J.,  
 Yoshikawa, C., & Zeng, N. (2006). Climate-carbon cycle feedback analysis: results  
 from the C<sup>4</sup>MIP model intercomparison. *Journal of Climate*, 19, 3337–3353. doi:10.  
 1175/JCLI3800.1.
- Gruber, N., Gloor, M., Mikaloff Fletcher, S. E., Doney, S. C., Dutkiewicz, S., Follows,  
 315 M. J., Gerber, M., Jacobson, A. R., Joos, F., Lindsay, K., Menemenlis, D., Mouchet,  
 A., Müller, S. A., Sarmiento, J. L., & Takahashi, T. (2009). Oceanic sources, sinks,  
 and transport of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 23, GB1005, doi:  
 10.1029/2008GB003349.

- Gruber, N., Sarmiento, J. L., & Stocker, T. F. (1996). An improved method for  
 320 detecting anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> in the oceans. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 10,  
 809–837. doi:10.1029/96gb01608.
- Harde, H. (2017). Scrutinizing the carbon cycle and CO<sub>2</sub> residence time in the at-  
 mosphere. *Global and Planetary Change*, 152, 19–26. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.  
 2017.02.009.
- 325 Hauck, J., Hoppema, M., Bellerby, R. G. J., Völker, C., & Wolf-Gladrow, D. (2010).  
 Data-based estimation of anthropogenic carbon and acidification in the Weddell  
 Sea on a decadal timescale. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 115, C03004. doi:10.  
 1029/2009JC005479.
- Heimann, M., & Maier-Reimer, E. (1996). On the relations between the oceanic  
 330 uptake of CO<sub>2</sub> and its carbon isotopes. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 10(1), 89–  
 110. doi:10.1029/95GB03191.
- Houghton, J. T., Jenkins, G. J., & Ephraums, J. J. (Eds.) (1990). *Climate Change -  
 The IPCC Scientific Assessment*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Humlum, O., Stordahl, K., & Solheim, J.-E. (2013). The phase relation between  
 335 atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature. *Global and Planetary Change*,  
 100, 51 – 69. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2012.08.008.
- Jones, C., Robertson, E., Arora, V., Friedlingstein, P., Shevliakova, E., Bopp, L.,  
 Brovkin, V., Hajima, T., Kato, E., Kawamiya, M., Liddicoat, S., Lindsay, K.,  
 Reick, C. H., Roelandt, C., Segschneider, J., & Tjiputra, J. (2013). Twenty-First-  
 340 Century Compatible CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions and Airborne Fraction Simulated by CMIP5  
 Earth System Models under Four Representative Concentration Pathways. *Journal  
 of Climate*, 26, 4398–4413. doi:10.1175/jcli-d-12-00554.1.
- Joos, F., Roth, R., Fuglestedt, J. S., Peters, G. P., Enting, I. G., von Bloh, W.,  
 Brovkin, V., Burke, E. J., Eby, M., Edwards, N. R., Friedrich, T., Frölicher, T. L.,  
 345 Halloran, P. R., Holden, P. B., Jones, C., Kleinen, T., Mackenzie, F. T., Matsumoto,  
 K., Meinshausen, M., Plattner, G.-K., Reisinger, A., Segschneider, J., Shaffer, G.,  
 Steinacher, M., Strassmann, K., Tanaka, K., Timmermann, A., & Weaver, A. J.  
 (2013). Carbon dioxide and climate impulse response functions for the computation

- of greenhouse gas metrics: a multi-model analysis. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 13, 2793–2825. doi:10.5194/acp-13-2793-2013.
- Kern, Z., & Leuenberger, M. (2013). Comment on *The phase relation between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature* Humlum et al. [Glob. Planet. Change 100: 5169.]: Isotopes ignored. *Global and Planetary Change*, 109, 1 – 2. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2013.07.002.
- Kohfeld, K. E., & Ridgwell, A. (2009). Glacial-interglacial variability in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. In E. Saltzman, & C. L. Quéré (Eds.), *Surface Ocean–Lower Atmospheres Processes* (pp. 251–286). Washington D.C.: AGU volume 187 of *Geophysical Monograph Series*. doi:10.1029/2008GM000845.
- Köhler, P. (2016). Using the Suess effect on the stable carbon isotope to distinguish the future from the past in radiocarbon. *Environmental Research Letters*, 11, 124016. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/11/12/124016.
- Köhler, P., Fischer, H., Munhoven, G., & Zeebe, R. E. (2005). Quantitative interpretation of atmospheric carbon records over the last glacial termination. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 19, GB4020. doi:10.1029/2004GB002345.
- Köhler, P., Fischer, H., Schmitt, J., Brook, E. J., & Marcott, S. A. (2015). Comment on *Synchronous records of pCO<sub>2</sub> and  $\Delta^{14}C$  suggest rapid, ocean-derived pCO<sub>2</sub> fluctuations at the onset of the Younger Dryas* by Steinhorsdottir et al. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 107, 267–270. doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2014.09.024.
- Landschützer, P., Gruber, N., & Bakker, D. C. E. (2016). Decadal variations and trends of the global ocean carbon sink. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 30, 1396–1417. doi:10.1002/2015gb005359.
- Lauvset, S. K., Key, R. M., Olsen, A., van Heuven, S., Velo, A., Lin, X., Schirnick, C., Kozyr, A., Tanhua, T., Hoppema, M., Jutterström, S., Steinfeldt, R., Jeansson, E., Ishii, M., Perez, F. F., Suzuki, T., & Watelet, S. (2016). A new global interior ocean mapped climatology: the 1° × 1° GLODAP version 2. *Earth System Science Data*, 8, 325–340. doi:10.5194/essd-8-325-2016.
- Le Quéré, C., Andrew, R. M., Canadell, J. G., Sitch, S., Korsbakken, J. I., Peters, G. P., Manning, A. C., Boden, T. A., Tans, P. P., Houghton, R. A., Keeling, R. F.,

- Alin, S., Andrews, O. D., Anthoni, P., Barbero, L., Bopp, L., Chevallier, F., Chini,  
 380 L. P., Ciais, P., Currie, K., Delire, C., Doney, S. C., Friedlingstein, P., Gkritzalis, T.,  
 Harris, I., Hauck, J., Haverd, V., Hoppema, M., Goldewijk, K. K., Jain, A. K., Kato,  
 E., Körtzinger, A., Landschützer, P., Lefèvre, N., Lenton, A., Lienert, S., Lombar-  
 dozzi, D., Melton, J. R., Metzl, N., Millero, F., Monteiro, P. M. S., Munro, D. R.,  
 Nabel, J. E. M. S., ichiro Nakaoka, S., O'Brien, K., Olsen, A., Omar, A. M., Ono,  
 385 T., Pierrot, D., Poulter, B., Rödenbeck, C., Salisbury, J., Schuster, U., Schwinger,  
 J., Séférian, R., Skjelvan, I., Stocker, B. D., Sutton, A. J., Takahashi, T., Tian, H.,  
 Tilbrook, B., van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Werf, G. R., Viovy, N., Walker,  
 A. P., Wiltshire, A. J., & Zaehle, S. (2016). Global Carbon Budget 2016. *Earth  
 System Science Data*, 8, 605–649. doi:10.5194/essd-8-605-2016.
- 390 Levin, I., Naegler, T., Kromer, B., Diehl, M., Francey, R. J., Gomez-Pelaz, A. J.,  
 Steele, L. P., Wagenbach, D., Weller, R., & Worthy, D. E. (2010). Observations  
 and modelling of the global distribution and long-term trend of atmospheric  $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ .  
*Tellus B*, 62, 26–46. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0889.2009.00446.x.
- Lord, N. S., Ridgwell, A., Thorne, M. C., & Lunt, D. J. (2016). An impulse response  
 395 function for the “long tail” of excess atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  in an Earth system model.  
*Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 30, 2–17. doi:10.1002/2014gb005074.
- Masters, T., & Benestad, R. (2013). Comment on “*The phase relation between atmo-  
 spheric carbon dioxide and global temperature*”. *Global and Planetary Change*, 106,  
 141 – 142. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2013.03.010.
- 400 Oeschger, H., Siegenthaler, U., Schotterer, U., & Gugelmann, A. (1975). A box dif-  
 fusion model to study the carbon dioxide exchange in nature. *Tellus*, 27, 168–192.  
 doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1975.tb01671.x.
- Past Interglacials Working Group of PAGES (2016). Interglacials of the last 800,000  
 years. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 54, 162–219. doi:10.1002/2015RG000482.
- 405 Petit, J. R., Jouzel, J., Raynaud, D., Barkov, N. I., Barnola, J.-M., Basile, I., Bender,  
 M., Chappellaz, J., Davis, M., Delaygue, G., Delmotte, M., Kotlyakov, V. M.,  
 Legrand, M., Lipenkov, V. Y., Lorius, C., Pépin, L., Ritz, C., Saltzman, E., &  
 Stievenard, M. (1999). Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years  
 from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica. *Nature*, 399, 429–436. doi:10.1038/20859.



- 410 Revelle, R., & Suess, H. E. (1957). Carbon dioxide exchange between atmosphere and ocean and the question of an increase of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> during the past decades. *Tellus*, 9(1), 18–27. doi:10.1111/j.2153-3490.1957.tb01849.x.
- Richardson, M. (2013). Comment on "The phase relation between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature" by Humlum, Stordahl and Solheim. *Global and*  
415 *Planetary Change*, 107, 226 – 228. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2013.03.011.
- Rubino, M., Etheridge, D. M., Trudinger, C. M., Allison, C. E., Battle, M. O., Langenfelds, R. L., Steele, L. P., Curran, M., Bender, M., White, J. W. C., Jenk, T. M., Blunier, T., & Francey, R. J. (2013). A revised 1000-year atmospheric  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ -CO<sub>2</sub> record from Law Dome and South Pole, Antarctica. *Journal of Geophysical*  
420 *Research: Atmospheres*, 118, 8482–8499. doi:10.1002/jgrd.50668.
- Sabine, C. L., Feely, R. A., Gruber, N., Key, R. M., Lee, K., Bullister, J. L., Wanninkhof, R., Wong, C. S., Tilbrook, D. W. W. B., Millero, F. J., Peng, T. H., Kozyr, A., Ono, T., & Rios, A. F. (2004). The Oceanic Sink for Anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub>. *Science*, 305, 367–371. doi:10.1126/science.1097403.
- 425 Stocker, T., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex, V., & Midgley, P. (Eds.) (2013). *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CB09781107415324.
- 430 Suess, H. E. (1955). Radiocarbon Concentration in Modern Wood. *Science*, 122, 415–417. doi:10.1126/science.122.3166.415-a.
- Volk, T., & Hoffert, M. I. (1985). Ocean carbon pumps: analysis of relative strengths and efficiencies in ocean-driven atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> changes. In E. T. Sundquist, & W. S. Broecker (Eds.), *The carbon cycle and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>: Natural variations*  
435 *archean and present* (pp. 99–110). Washington, D.C., USA: American Geophysical Union volume 32 of *Geophysical Monograph*. doi:10.1029/GM032p0099.
- Zeebe, R. E., & Wolf-Gladrow, D. A. (2001). *CO<sub>2</sub> in Seawater: Equilibrium, Kinetics, Isotopes*. Elsevier Oceanography Book Series. Elsevier Science Publishing, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.